

**November 18, 2004**

**MEMORANDUM**

**UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**TO:** Jim McMinimee, P.E., Chairman

**FROM:** Barry Axelrod  
Recorder, Standards Committee

**SUBJECT:** Standards Committee Meeting Minutes and Next Meeting

The next meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, February 24, 2005 at 8:00 a.m., in the main 1st floor conference room of the Rampton Complex. The December 16, 2004 meeting was canceled. The tentative agenda for the meeting follows. Additional agenda items and supporting information will be added prior to the meeting.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>
1. Minutes of October 21, 2004	For approval	Barry Axelrod
2. Supplemental Specification 00555, Prosecution and Progress, Liquidated Damages Table	For approval	Pete Negus
3. Supplemental Specification 02843, Crash Cushions	For approval	Glenn Schulte
4. Standard Drawing DD 4, Geometric Design for Freeways (Roadway)	For approval	Brent Jensen
5. FHWA Coordination and Approval of Standards	For discussion	Todd Emery
6. Review of Assignment/Action Log	For review	Jim McMinimee
7. Meeting Improvements (on-going agenda item)	For discussion	Jim McMinimee
8. Other Business		

JCM/ba  
Attachments

cc:

Cory Pope Director, Region One	Stan Burns Engineering Services	Richard Miller Standards
Randy Park Director, Region Two	Todd Jensen Structures	Barry Axelrod Standards
Tracy Conti Director, Region Three	Darrell Giannonatti Construction	Patti Charles Standards
Dal Hawks Director, Region Four	Tim Biel Materials	Shana Lindsey Research
	Richard Clarke Maintenance	Carlos Machado and Todd Emery FHWA
	Robert Hull Traffic and Safety	Mont Wilson AGC
		Tyler Yorgason ACEC

October 21, 2004

A regular meeting of the Standards Committee convened at 8:00 am, Thursday, October 21, 2004, in the 4th floor Project Development Conference Room of the Rampton Complex.

Members Present:

Jim McMinimee	Project Development	Chairman
Richard Miller	Standards and Specifications	Secretary
Barry Axelrod	Standards and Specifications	Recorder
Randy Park	Region 2	Member
Stan Burns	Engineering Services	Member
John Leonard for Robert Hull	Safety	Member
Todd Jensen	Structures	Member
Darrell Giannonatti	Construction	Member
Lloyd Neely for Richard Clarke	Maintenance	Member
Tim Biel	Materials	Member
Todd Emery	FHWA	Advisory Member
Mont Wilson	AGC	Advisory Member
Tyler Yorgason	ACEC	Advisory Member

Members Absent:

Robert Hull	Safety	Member
Richard Clarke	Maintenance	Member
Carlos Machado	FHWA	Advisory Member

Staff:

Barry Axelrod	Standards and Specifications
Pete Negus	Construction
Michael Fazio	Hydraulics
Glenn Schulte	Traffic and Safety

Visitors:

Karl Verhaeren	Region 4 Construction
----------------	-----------------------

## Standards Committee Meeting

Minutes of the October 21, 2004 meeting:

1. Minutes of August 26, 2004 meeting were approved as written.

**Motion:** Darrell Giannonatti made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Seconded by Tim Biel. Passed unanimously.

2. CB Series Standard Drawings and Supplemental Specifications 02610, Pipe, Pipe-Arch, Structural Plate Pipe and Structural Pipe Arch and 02374, Grouted Riprap (Agenda Item 2) - Presented by Michael Fazio.

Michael said the initial presentation was done at the last meeting. Several changes were recommended at that time. Michael pointed out that the changes were to be coordinated with AGC and ACEC in time for this meeting. Michael said that Barry Axelrod submitted several editorial type changes to him on the drawings. Michael said that Tyler Yorgason, ACEC representative, also had several comments that will be incorporated into the drawings.

Commenting on the gravel riprap sample size, Michael indicated that Tyler thought smaller projects might not meet that requirement. Michael said he agreed.

Discussion points were:

- Jim asked if testing the sample was prescribed in a testing method. How is this going to work? Jim said the testing is a standardized test on a standardized sample. Michael went on to explain.
- Todd pointed out a typo in Section 02610, article 1.4, paragraph A2.

Continuing with his presentation Michael said that Tyler had asked why only one type of cast gutter was indicated on CB 1 through CB 4 when he submitted his submittal sheet comments during coordination. Michael said he would update CB 1 through CB 4 for additional types with a note. He then handed out a copy of the GW 2 Standard Drawing.

Michael said that Tyler had also suggested that reinforcing be shown on the CB 11 details. Michael said he would do that. He then pointed out that notes 6 and 11 on CB 11 referred to reinforcing steel and that while reviewing these notes he noticed the reference in note 11 was incorrect. This will be corrected. Michael said that note 14 would be modified to show more detail based on Tyler's input.

Discussion points were:

- Barry asked if the change was to the GW drawing or the CB drawings. Michael said the use of different curb and gutter will be by reference on the CB drawings. Todd pointed out that the drawings do not reference any specific type of curb and gutter. Barry then pointed out the copy of the GW drawing that Michael had handed out was from the 2002 version, not the 2004 version. Michael said that was all right for purposes of this discussion.
- Following up a comment made by Michael about shifting a drawing to the December meeting, Barry reviewed the schedule for publishing the 2005 Standards by January. Barry said that this schedule would be very tight and time consuming; adding that he thought the December meeting should be cancelled. The February 2005 meeting would be the next meeting. Michael said he could make the changes next week and send them to all the committee members. Barry said if all that is being done is adding some clarification that has been approved in the past. In response to what was being added, Michael said that compaction requirements for subgrade and thickness of the subgrade would be added. Michael said he would get the updated drawing out for review by the Committee by the end of next week. Barry said the deadline for the drawings is not as critical as that for the specifications that have to get to the printer.
- Glenn asked about the deadline for updates. Barry said they need everything by November 4<sup>th</sup>. Glenn said he was asking because he is in the process of rewriting Section 02843 and it won't be ready and approved. He said the changes would have to be a supplemental specification. Barry said this plan was discussed and approved at the last meeting in August. Glenn said in that case there would be a supplemental specification right off the bat. Barry agreed, adding that was known when the decision was made in August. We can't keep delaying the bound copy publication. Skipping the December meeting would eliminate supplemental specifications being approved to a book still being printed.
- Glenn asked if he got his changes put together and sent the document to the Committee for approval, would that be acceptable. Barry asked Glenn if that process could be completed by November 4<sup>th</sup>. Glenn said yes and that the specification was just about done now. Jim said that we could discuss Glenn's changes when we get to his item on the agenda.

**Motion:** Darrell Giannonatti made a motion to approve the CB Series Standard Drawings and Supplemental Specifications 02610 and 02374 as discussed and modified during the meeting. Seconded by Randy Park. Passed unanimously.

3. Supplemental Specifications 01452M, Profilograph and Pavement Smoothness; 02221, Remove Structure and Obstruction; 02222, Site Demolition - Concrete deletion; 02224, Dispose of Asphalt Pavement deletion; 02316M, Roadway Excavation; and 02748M, Prime Coat/Tack Coat (Agenda Item 3) - Presented by Karl Verhaeren.

Karl said the main change to 01452 is the addition of Stone Matrix Asphalt (SMA).

Discussion points were:

- Jim commented that he wasn't that familiar with SMA, asking if SMA is like a slurry. Darrell said no, SMA has thickness and structural strength. Darrell said SMA has a surface course that never has to be milled off.
- Jim said his question was geared more toward the smoothness specification being applied to that material. He asked if other states apply the smoothness specification to this material, adding that he didn't want to be the groundbreaking state. The response was there are other states.
- Darrell asked Mont if he had any comments. Mont said it was fine, adding that there is some confusion in the construction world. He related a specific instance of using another type of equipment for the testing. Darrell said all that needs to be done is to bring them everything that person has done over the previous three months for review by Construction.
- Randy asked how often do we use SMA. Karl said it has been used on three or four projects.
- There was no further significant discussion on 01452.

Karl then discussed Section 02221. He said this section and 02222 needed to be discussed together. The proposal is to combine the two sections. Karl related the history of the two sections. To better cover this part the following was taken from the submittal sheet for Section 02222.

The reason for the proposed deletion of this Section (02222) is for simplification and incorporation of this section into Section 02221, Remove Structure and Obstruction. When Section 02222 was first created in the Department's 1999 Standard Specifications, it was entitled "Site Demolition – Pavement" and included the description for work involving removal of concrete curb and gutter, driveways, bituminous curb, both asphalt and concrete pavements, and obliteration of road.

Under the Department's previous Standard Specifications, Obliterate Road was a section unto itself, and site demolition work was included in Removal of Structure and Obstruction. Through the evolution of the Department's Standard Specifications, the title of 02222 was changed to "Site Demolition – Concrete", although the Measurement and Payment was never updated to reflect the new section title. Between 1999 and present, asphalt pavement seemed to disappear from the specification, and "Obliteration" became an article that appears to only address Portland Cement Concrete Pavement.

The removal and disposal of most all items included in this section is virtually identical to the work described under 02221. This, combined with the fact the AASHTO Guide Specifications include demolition and removal of pavements and related items under "Remove Structure and Obstruction," seems to make combining these sections appropriate.

Discussion points were:

- Richard commented about an e-mail he received from Betty Purdie. In that e-mail Betty commented that the coordination showed contact with AGC and ACEC but not with the designers. Darrell said Ed Rock was involved in the discussions. Richard indicated that Betty said that but that she wanted to make sure this didn't change what Ed had already worked on. Darrell commented that Ed was involved in the changes in the last major revision to these specifications. Karl said that Ed was happy to see these changes and that he supported going back this way. Richard indicated that Betty wasn't sure about that when she read the submittal sheets. Richard was satisfied and indicated he would pass these comments on to Betty.
- Tyler pointed out a couple of editorial type changes. These were noted.
- Karl pointed out that Measurement and Payment (M and P) are impacted with these changes. Karl commented about other M and P changes, indicating he would include them when he submitted the final updates for these sections.
- There was no further discussion on these two sections.

Section 02224 was discussed next. Karl covered the issues related to this section. He explained that the section was created to address specific problems in Region 2 but complicates contracts. Karl pointed out that Contractors have to refer to more than one section to obtain the necessary information. He said there are better ways to handle the issues. Karl referred to the submittal sheet for other information.

The submittal sheet indicates that Section 02224 is deficient in that it doesn't address issues with disposal of concrete pavements, or any items other than asphalt pavement. While it could be modified to do so, Section 02221 already addresses the removal and disposal of various items and it's more logical and appropriate the language dealing with disposal issues be addressed in Section 02221.

Karl said the concern was to make sure material is disposed of properly. He added that items in 02224 are now in Section 02221, Remove Structure or Obstruction or Section 02316, Roadway Excavation.

Discussion points were:

- Jim commented about a group, chaired by Lynn Bernhard that came to the QIC to discuss the proper disposal of surplus material. Jim asked Randy if he remembered this. Randy said it had to do with rotomilling tailings and whether the Department was selling the tailings versus giving them away. Jim then asked if this fell into this specification. Karl said he didn't see that this area would cover rotomilling.
- In response to a question by Randy, Karl said Roadway Excavation is being paid by quantity because of a surveying issue. Karl said the designer has the option for pavement removal by quantity or area. Randy asked if there is a benefit of having consistency to say one way or the other this is how we are going to do it. Karl said he didn't know, adding that in the past the Department has done it both ways. Randy said how the regions work is going to be a preconstruction engineer preference. Karl said even with that you wouldn't have the same preference from project to project. Randy said the plan set would have to specify how the Department wants it done and the Contractor would bid it that way. Mont said the designer should have the latitude to pick option "A" or "B."
- There was no further discussion on 02224.

Section 02316 was discussed next. Karl said this change is based on the proposed elimination of Section 02224.

Discussion points were:

- Referring to paragraph E to be added to Article 1.6, Randy asked Karl how did he foresee the designers including payment in Roadway Excavation. Is it going to be spelled out in the plans or by special provision? Karl said if Roadway Excavation quantities include it then it is done that way. Karl said he didn't think any explanation was needed. He said it isn't specifically stated as being in there but by default it is. Randy asked how does the Contractor know that. Karl said because there is no bid item to remove asphalt pavement. Discussion continued on how to look at this from a designer and Contractor viewpoint. Randy said communicating the bid item information is the issue as well as how to make it clear.
- Karl said one potential problem is if you create a bid item for remove asphalt pavement and don't deduct the quantity from roadway excavation you could end up paying for it twice. Lloyd said he could see that happening. Randy said he couldn't see that happening very often.



- He reemphasized the communication issue. Darrell said it is a process issue. Randy said a notice could be sent to preconstruction and construction personnel.
- There was no further discussion.

Section 02748 was discussed next. Karl asked Tim to help present this item. Tim said they still have issues with inconsistent application of how to pay for Tack Coat. Tim said it is addressed in the chip seal specification. The issue is related to the practice of diluting with water. Tim said that it is done by special provision if the Department decides to do it. The Contractor by can do it by choice as well. Tim said it would be paid for at two to one. He said some editorial changes were made to the article on traffic control.

Karl said that two options are presented in the change.

Discussion points were:

- Mont said he liked the alternate text.
- Tim again explained how it is done if either the Department or Contractor wants to use water.
- Karl asked the Committee which option they wanted to go with. The Committee decided on the alternate text.
- There was no further significant discussion.

**Motion:** Darrell Giannonatti made a motion to approve Supplemental Specifications 01452M, 02221, 02222 (deletion), 02224 (deletion), 02316M, and 02748M as discussed and modified. Seconded by Tim. Passed unanimously.

4. Change to 01282, Payment and 00555, Prosecution and Progress impacting 2005 Spec Book (Agenda Item 4) - Presented by Pete Negus.

Pete said the AGC asked that rotomilling be added as a fuel adjustable item. The Stone Matrix Asphalt (SMA) was also added at the request of the Region Construction Engineers. Pete said they would like these updates included in the 2005 specifications.

Discussion points were:

- Darrell asked Mont if any AGC comments were not addressed. Mont said there are a lot of items in use today that don't show up in the table. Mont said this causes confusion in the field.

- Mont asked if mobilization was included in fuel adjustment. He then asked if for example a \$200,000 Traffic Control item was included. Darrell said it doesn't at this time, adding that we should go back to the AGC for further discussion. Darrell said there might be other items that need to be added. Mont said they need something that addresses these issues that is flexible.
- Karl said according to the specification anything that needs to be adjusted must be in the table. Randy commented that the table could be outdated in a year. He asked if there are any industry standards that can be referred to instead of creating a table. Pete referred to the submittal sheet on his findings of other DOT's doing fuel adjustments. The text from the submittal sheet follows: During the process of determining a fuel adjustment factor for rotomilling, I (Pete) contacted several State DOT's about a fuel usage factor for rotomilling. All of the states I contacted did not have provisions for fuel adjustments. Based on this small sampling, it seems that UDOT is in the minority and we may want to revisit, at a later date, the concept of Adjustable Items and Fuel Usage Factors.
- Darrell said it would be great if we could reference an industry standard. Jim commented about AGC National not having something on this. Karl and Pete commented about the information coming from a national document. Pete said it came from an FHWA Technical Advisory dated December 10, 1980 and approximately matched the one in Section 01282.
- Wording in the specification to cover more options and cost levels was discussed. Darrell asked Mont for his suggested wording. Mont said he wasn't sure because what is going on today can't compare to the future. Mont did suggest that for the items on the list if the aggregate at bid time exceeds \$100,000 then pay for it, if not then don't.
- Both Darrell and Karl commented that fuel usage factors and adjustments are ongoing issues.
- Jim commented that there has been a lot of discussion on this item but the purpose behind the submittal form is to have this discussion occur somewhere else. Jim asked if this is an item that we don't do anything with, table, and let Pete do further work on it. Darrell said we would lose the opportunity to add rotomilling and the other items.
- Karl said this is a step in the right direction and that everyone is in agreement that this is better than what we have in the specifications now. There is a lot more work to do.
- Addressing Darrell, Jim said you are willing to entertain passing this and then assigning Pete to do further research, working with Mont and others. Darrell agreed. Darrell then made a motion.

**Motion:** Darrell Giannonatti made a motion to approve Supplemental Specification 01282M with the understanding that we are going to further work and try to come up with something better than what we have now. Seconded by Tim Biel with one contingency.

- Tim said a modification needs to be made to the table. He said the format of the table isn't consistent pointing out how HMA and SMA are listed. He said the Portland Cement Concrete Pavement and Lean Concrete Base Course items need to be split into two separate line items or separated with a comma.

**Motion:** Darrell accepted the amendment. Passed unanimously. (Note: This item applies to the 2005 Specifications.)

Pete then presented the Liquidated Damages item. He handed out an updated table with suggested changes. This was not previously coordinated with the Committee for their review prior to the meeting. Pete said the CFR requires this information be reviewed every two years and updated as necessary and that FHWA approval is needed for updates. He said the next review is not due until 2005 but with a new set of specifications coming out in January he thought this would be a good time to update the table.

Referring to the updated table he just handed out, Pete said the proposed changes are in bold and are based on their calculations. He said the new values do not significantly change compared to the old values. He added that in some cases the values go down, reflecting the efficiency of the field crews. Pete said that we should get Frank Long and Todd Emery at FHWA to approve the table as is for the new specification edition. Pete said when he initially put together the submittal sheet he hadn't run through the numbers yet.

Discussion points were:

- In response to a comment that he was recommending no change, Pete said that was correct.
- Todd Jensen asked how the numbers are calculated. Pete explained the process based on the last two years of data.
- Karl commented that not all the numbers went down and in fact one area almost doubled.
- Jim asked if this is a risk item, meaning that for Contractors this isn't a bid item, what impact does lowering the costs of liquidated damages have on that risk. Pete said he was wondering if the Contractor would take it seriously if the cost is not substantial.
- Karl said there is a danger of having those dollars set significantly high compared to actual costs because the Contractor could challenge them.

- Darrell recommended rounding the new numbers to the nearest ten and going with that.
- Jim asked about the FHWA approval. Pete said that according to the CFR that approval is required every two years. Tim asked how do we approve the change in this meeting if we don't know what FHWA is going to say.
- Randy commented that we either use incentives/disincentives or liquidated damages, but not both. He asked if that is a true statement. Randy said he doesn't remember ever using both. Darrell said they should be considered two separate issues. Jim commented that the Department is working on a claim that has both on it. Darrell said this is a training issue on their part.
- Tim asked to go back to his question. He said he has a hard time voting on something that may or may not be acceptable by FHWA. Jim said he couldn't imagine them not accepting our analysis. Jim asked Todd Emery to comment.
- Todd said it would be acceptable to them if the costs covered the CE. He commented about minimums. Responding to a comment by Karl, Jim said we have to be able to defend whatever is in the chart.
- Todd Jensen said he agreed with the rounding presented by Darrell. Referring to the 2363 figure, Pete said we probably need to put that in line someplace. Darrell asked if the reason the figure is so far out of line with the other figures is because we don't have a statistically representative sample. Pete said there were a lot of jobs in that range. Randy said that is why we probably have the best sample there.
- Pete said they could defend the values based on the numbers they have. Tim said he has a hard time defending leaving it as is.

**Motion:** Darrell Giannonatti made a motion to accept the changes to the Liquidated Damages table with the new numbers rounded up to the nearest ten and that approval be obtained from FHWA. Seconded by Todd Jensen.

- Lloyd said he was wondering if we really have a representative number of projects in each category to be comfortable with the numbers. Discussion continued on sample size. Pete said that was one reason he suggested not changing the table, adding the last time they had two complete years. This time they did not. Discussion continued on the method of determining the values.
- Mont commented that it doesn't seem logical to have a five to ten million dollar job have a lower value compared to a one to five million dollar job. Jim asked if the sample for those levels were statistically representative. Pete listed the number of projects in the areas in question. Todd Jensen commented that the 2363 value did look odd compared to the other values.

- Jim commented that the average size job is \$3.7 million. He asked what is one standard deviation. He said we might need to look at these categories from that standpoint in that the current categories are artificial compared to the distribution of jobs.
- Jim commented that we again have had a lot of discussion on this item and that we do have a motion on the floor. He said we should go ahead and vote to pass it as is or if not to go back and do more work on it.
- Darrell withdrew his motion. Pete asked if we would use the existing table for the 2005 specification book. Jim said we would use the existing table and do further work on the issue. He said if he understood Pete's opening comments we are not required to modify the table. Pete agreed adding that in 2005 we should review the table. Pete said he thought we could take advantage of the book coming out in January.

**Motion:** Withdrawn by Darrell Giannonatti.

- Jim asked if everyone was comfortable with referring this issue back for further review and do more statistical work on it. Richard commented about getting FHWA approval before bring this back to the Standards Committee.

**Action Item:** Pete Negus to complete additional review and statistical analysis of Liquidated Damages table in Section 00555, Prosecution and Progress.

5. New Products Panel Update and Crash Cushions (Agenda Item 5) - Presented by Glenn Schulte.

Glenn provided an update since the last meeting. He said the New Products Panel (NPP) met on September 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss the issues brought up at the last Standards Committee meeting. He said Mack Christensen was appointed by the NPP to do a study. Glenn said he thought a contractor was hired to do the study. That study is still in process. Glenn said he is about two-thirds to three-quarters done on putting the new crash cushion guidelines together. These guidelines would include all the newly approved systems. He said they would go from there in making changes based on the study findings. Glenn said he didn't know the time frame on the study.

Glenn then reviewed the notice that was part of his Standards Committee submittal. He said the notice indicates that all the new systems are conditional and all the currently approved systems are going to be conditional.

Discussion points were:

- Jim asked Glenn what he wanted from the Committee. Glenn said he wanted them to approve the notice to go in the guidelines and to send a copy of the notice to all vendors who currently supply systems to UDOT.

- Jim asked about the downside if the notice isn't approved. Stan said they have inputs from the regions about "first costs" versus "final costs." He said regions are saying they are stuck with accepting "as is" attenuators. Stan said putting this notice in the guidelines would tell the contractors that we are doing a study based on life-cycle costs. Stan said that study would make recommendations where any cutoff will be on any attenuator. Right now every attenuator vendor believes they have from here until the end of time the right to put attenuators on UDOT systems. This notice states they have conditional rights now. Stan said once we figure out total costs a determination will be made as to where to cut the line. Stan said the downside is that vendors would have the false impression that their system is going to be out there forever.
- Jim asked if the Department wanted the Standards Committee to approve this notice because in the future attenuators would be approved by this body. Stan said no, adding that would be the second phase. Stan said the regions question whether the New Products Panel has the authority to make any decision. Stan said if the Standards Committee accepts this language (in the notice) you are de facto saying that you will be more involved in that process. Darrell commented that he thought by policy we gave that committee that authority. Stan said people are questioning whether the policy should be revised.
- Stan said he has talked about this with Shana Lindsey who will be assuming her position in Research next week. He said they discussed putting a QIT together to review the policy and see if Research wanted to continue accepting all new products through the New Products Panel or whether the Standards Committee should be the final arbiter.
- Jim said it is a process problem for us, adding that the Standards Committee is caught in a situation if we do this not only do we take ownership, someone could question whether we have the authority to govern this issue.
- John discussing how the problem came about said that at the last Standards Committee meeting the Committee indicated the process followed by the subcommittee that approved the crash cushions was appropriate. John said some of the individuals who didn't have feedback from their team member felt all the aspects might not have been looked at. John said he thought the Standards Committee said they would not review and approve each individual crash cushion but asked that the New Products Panel go back and review the process. John said based on that task they set up a meeting to review the issue. From that meeting he said they came up with a more formal research investigation of looking at life-cycle cost, exposure, and ease of installation to name a few. He said there were subjective and non-subjective factors. John said he wasn't sure if approval of the notice was needed but they wanted to let the Standards Committee know the direction being taken and that they are proceeding to address the concerns of the regions as well as those of the Standards Committee.

- John said their proposal is to let the vendors know we are going through a complete review of all systems; both previously approved and recently approved systems. He said based on the criteria that Stan already discussed there would be some cutoff. John said that while they would try to foster competition they would also take into account factors that best address the value the Department would receive from the systems. John said they are asking for the Standards Committee's concurrence that they are proceeding in the right direction but not an approval. Each new product would not have to come before the Standards Committee for review and approval. John said the notice would be placed at the front of the new crash cushion guidelines coming out at the beginning of the year. He said they would also send out the same information in letterform to all vendors.
- Jim asked for Committee comments or if anyone had a problem with sending out the notice. There were no comments. Jim thanked Stan and John for the information and that the Committee agreed the New Projects Panel was heading in the right direction.

At this point Jim had to leave for another commitment. Stan ran the meeting.

6. Standard Drawings BA 1 Series (Agenda Item 6) – Presented by Glenn Schulte.

Glenn said BA 1A and 1B are updates to current drawings and that 1C through 1E are new drawings. Glenn said the changes came about by the review of the Standard Drawings being accomplished by Pete Negus and by designers. He said the drawings were updated with minor changes to the installations and pins for example. Glenn said he sent the drawings out for coordination to quite a few people but only received two comments. He said the list included designers, maintenance technicians, and traffic engineers.

Discussion points were:

- In response to a question Glenn said the pins on BA 1B were changed based on comments from Contractors who indicated they couldn't get the pins in and out. Glenn said they provided options on how to build the pins. He said the washer size was also changed for the same reason.
- Someone asked if testing needed to be done. Glenn said no. John said the pin is identical to the original pin. There is no operation impact. The pin is the exact same length from the shoulder down. Above the shoulder there is a lifting device.

- Glenn said this design was used on end sections years ago but was removed because of improper use. He said in all conversations with the traffic engineers, construction people, and designers we are spending a lot of money on low-end roadway crash cushions. He added that according to FHWA we could use a concrete slope end section on roadways 40 mph or less. Glenn said as a result they decided to put the drawing back together. Glenn said the drawing is the same as it was 10 years ago for the most part. He said this barrier costs \$600 where the typical crash cushion costs \$1500 to \$1600.
- In response to a question as to whether this is another option Glenn said it was.
- Todd commented about the rebar bend shown on BA 1A and that there is only one inch of clearance on the cover. He said corrosion could be a problem. Glenn said that was a mistake, adding that it would be a two-inch cover. Following up Todd said it is a tight bend and may not fit. Glenn said this detail has been in use for three years and has not been a problem.
- Discussion continued about BA 1C being used in areas of 40 mph or less. Glenn suggested adding that fact to the title of the drawings and not just in a note. This would make usage clearer.
- A question was asked if BA 1C was for use in just work zones. Glenn said, no it is permanent. A reference was then made to note 1 that refers to work zones. Glenn said he would correct that.
- Glenn said BA 1D and 1E are placement drawings. He said that according to the Roadside Design Guide the barrier needs to be anchored to be effective. Glenn said these two drawings show the location of the stabilization pins. This was not previously identified. Glenn added that they have been asked several times for a pay item. He said he didn't think one is required. He said if the barrier isn't tied at the beginning or end it will not create the required tension. Glenn said during testing the first two sections are always pinned. The drawing shows that requirement.
- Referring to the drawing someone asked Glenn what he defined as a pave surface. Glenn said asphalt but any paved surface is acceptable. John asked if a compacted surface would work. Glenn said a good compaction on rotomillings would work if it wouldn't wash away. Tim asked if it could be defined as a non-erodable surface. Glenn said they could do that.
- Glenn said the biggest concern in Contractor meetings is why do they need to pin the barrier if we have three feet behind it. Glenn said that has now been clarified on where and when to pin the barrier. He said very strict guidelines have been provided, adding nothing in the specification or pay items change.



- Stan asked if the Committee wanted to see the corrections made and brought to the next meeting. Someone asked if most of the changes were editorial in nature. Barry said if approved now the drawings could get in the 2005 standards.

**Motion:** John Leonard made a motion to approve the BA 1 Series Standard Drawings as discussed and modified. Seconded by Darrell Giannonatti. Passed unanimously.

Pete asked how the 2005 drawings would relate to the 2005 edition of the Standard Specifications. Barry said for 2005 they were coming out with a new complete set of standards. All 2004 areas will be duplicated and updated for 2005. Pete asked if there was a timetable for the drawings like the specifications. Barry said one unresolved issue is electronic signatures. Barry added that once the drawings are signed all they need is a week to put the electronic drawing book together. He said all the drawings would be needed by the third week of November so they could complete all required tasks. With the various holidays Barry said they need the entire month of December and the last week of November. Pete said he was wondering about all the proposed changes to the Standard Drawings. Barry said if not approved this month then they would be part of the first change to the 2005 book.

Glenn said they have constant slope barrier changes coming out as well as transition elements for W-Beam. He said these changes are based on 350 testing and that he couldn't get the changes out sooner. John said they are coming out with an all-new TC Series as well. Barry says that is nothing new, but what they don't want to do is rush changes through only to have to change them again. Barry said they still need to come out in January with a new set of Standard Drawings. He said this meeting is the last one to approve anything that will be going into the Standards.

Glenn presented a new item for discussion on Section 02843. He said he has redone the specification, asking if he sent it out to everyone on the Committee could it get in the 2005 book.

Discussion points were:

- Barry said they aren't going to wait for changes and that it needs to be to them by the deadline. Barry said that if the change is not received by their absolute drop-dead date they would go without it unless Jim says to wait. If not Barry said they would be back to where they were earlier this year.
- Stan asked if the Committee had seen any of the work on this section. Glenn said no. Glenn said he discussed the changes with Karl. Karl said he thought the changes were minor but wasn't sure.

- Glenn said one of the issues is that the specification includes design issues that don't belong in the specification. He said new issues were also addressed. Karl said it sounds more like a need for a supplemental specification. Barry said given Glenn's comments there is no way the proper coordination process to include AGC and ACEC could be completed in time to make the 2005 book. Stan asked if that was every else's consensus. There was agreement.

**Action Item:** Glenn Schulte to update Section 02843 to include completing coordination process on the submittal sheet.

7. Supplemental Specification 02741, Hot Mix Asphalt (Agenda Item 7) – Presented by Tim Biel.

Tim said this section has been used as a Special Provision for the last 18 months. He said over that time they have made several minor revisions and now think the section is ready for approval as a standard. Tim said the Pavement Council had discussed the section over three or four meetings. He said the industry had a lot of input. Tim said this is the base document they use in everything they do and have tried to minimize the changes to the special over the last year and a half.

Discussion points were:

- Barry said the file is formatted as a special provision and not a standard. He also said that based on the formatting of the file it appears that some parts are from a previous version not the most current standard. Barry asked if there are major sections that don't change from the current standard so that the entire section doesn't have to be replaced by a supplemental specification, just the changed parts. Barry said he tried to review the section but didn't have time to go through it letter by letter and try to figure out what had changed. He said he did find some mistakes that needed to be fixed.
- Tim said the only major correction if you want to call it that was that they went through the section to make sure all the ASTM and AASHTO references were appropriate. Barry said he did check that part and some of the references in Article 1.3 don't match the text and references in the text don't match Article 1.3. Barry said 1.3 B was added as a reference but is not in the body of the specification. The same applies for 1.3 D and 1.3 X. Barry pointed out the references covered in the text but not added to the reference article. Barry said all references need to be crosschecked in both directions. Barry said that was one of the reasons he couldn't tell what version was being used. Tim said when they started with this section he had one of his people go through the latest version on the Web. Barry said before the section comes back to them the references need to be crosscheck.

- Getting back to the format Barry said given that the section is 30 pages, Contractors are going to have a hard time figuring out the changes so they know how to adjust bids. Tim said technically nothing has changed because they have been using the special for a while.
- Barry added that they did not publish this special provision as a Department Special. Karl said the bottom line is that most contracts have not had the standard as part of the project. Barry asked that when they publish the change as a supplemental specification would a note on their “What’s New” Web page to the fact that this section incorporated a special provision help clarify the change. Karl said that he followed what Barry was saying but from his perspective he didn’t think the change should be a 2004 Supplemental Specification. Karl thought the section should be incorporated in the 2005 specifications. Barry said that was not addressed on the submittal sheet with a priority three and that he didn’t get any of that from the inputs. Tim said the intent was for inclusion in the 2005 specifications and that he might not have communicated that properly. Barry said that takes care of the formatting issues but the reference issue still needed to be resolved. Barry said that clears up how they will publish the change.

**Motion:** Randy Park made a motion to approve Standard Specification 02741 as discussed to include the reference crosscheck and modified for use in the 2005 Standards. Seconded by Darrell Giannonatti. Passed unanimously.

8. Supplemental Specification 06055, Timber & Timber Treatment (Agenda Item 8) – Presented by Tim Biel.

Tim said based on the previous discuss he wasn’t sure if Bill filled out the submittal sheet properly. Tim said the change came about as a result of environmental issues. He said the industry had stopped using the Department’s standard chromated copper arsenate (CCA). He pointed out some of the changes in the specification.

Discussion points were:

- Barry commented about the priority two on the submittal sheet.
- Barry asked if this change needed to be a 2004 supplemental specification and not just a change in the 2005 book.
- Discussion continued on the priority issue. Tim said he didn’t think they needed to be proactive on the change. He said a priority three would work.

**Motion:** Tim Biel made a motion to approve Supplemental Specification 06055 as discussed and modified as a priority three not a priority two. Seconded by Todd Jensen. Passed unanimously.

9. Establish Standards for Median Widths in Urban Areas (Agenda Item 9) – Presented by Todd Jensen.

Todd said he would cover this item for Brent. Todd said this came up as a big issue on the Legacy Highway Environmental Document. He said the discussion revolves around Standard Drawing DD 4 and the width of the median. What should we be using in an urban area?

Todd provided a historical background from a Legacy Highway perspective. He said as far as he could remember the median use to be a 64-foot width. Todd said he contacted Farrell Wright. Farrell remembered the same thing. Todd said the issue came up while the Legacy Team was reviewing Standard Drawings in trying to determine where we differed from AASHTO. He said they were also looking for opportunities to save money on our roadways. Todd said at Legacy they changed this to a clear zone requirement. He said they got challenged at Legacy on their right of way width. He said they then went back and took a close look at every aspect of this particular Standard Drawing.

Todd said he is here to recommend some of the findings that came out of their investigation. He referred to the sources they used, indicating the AASHTO Green Book as a good source as was the Roadside Design Guide. He said they also found some TRB research information that FHWA had done in 1993. He said no definitive document comes right out and says the median should be “x” amount of width, but there is a lot of study information available. Todd said why not just put in a median barrier to start with. He said in general the Roadside Design Guide safety information indicates not having something to hit is safer. He said if you can eliminate an obstacle it is safer.

Todd said with that in mind they think it is appropriate when looking at a new roadway to have an open median width. Todd commented when looking at that, what should it be. Todd said the old 64-foot width came from the fact that you could add a lane in each direction in the middle and still not need barrier in the future. Todd said that is prudent planning and we should be looking at the future when looking at roadways. Todd said the challenge comes when asking why is it 64 feet when they were challenged on the Legacy Project. He said ultimately when they started looking at this that was the only justification they could find. He said looking at the Department’s philosophy in getting as much as we can for our money in our roadway design they looked at all the information and research they could find. Todd said based on that they are recommending a 50-foot minimum median width. He said the Roadside Design Guide table, included in the agenda package, has a supporting chart.

Discussion points were:

- Randy commented about the clear zone. Todd said the clear zone would be less. Todd said they are recommending if you go to a 30-foot width you would need a barrier. Todd said they are recommending a 50-foot minimum.

- Randy referencing high volume Interstate or high volume roadways at least in urban areas said barrier is being put down, whether it is cable barrier or Jersey barrier for example. Randy said they have this distance but they have to go back and retrofit. He said it seems to him that the Standard then would deviate from our practice. Randy said what he is more concerned about is given the issues on Legacy maybe we should just do a design modification.
- Todd commented that he wasn't sure what Randy was asking. Randy said even when you have 64 feet they are putting in barrier. He said that is based on a high ADT and accident rate. Randy said it is more like a roadway type and volume discussion versus a distance discussion.
- Todd discussed the reasons for recommending the 50-foot distance. He said with the research from a safety standpoint you can go with barrier at that distance and that is the cutoff point. Todd said you can still put in a lane but would need a barrier. Todd said by going from a 64 to a 50 you are losing that ability, adding that he agreed with Randy. Todd gave an example, stating that on a particular project even though they had the 50 feet, they didn't feel comfortable not having a barrier because of the crossover accidents. Todd said they are seeing it as a balance that they don't have to get into a discussion of having the ability to widen in the future if we go with a 50-foot distance, yet it still protects that option and in the mean time it is safe in most cases without a barrier now.
- Randy commented about still being able to add a lane in both directions with the 50-foot median. Todd said with this distance you give up not having a barrier where with the 64-foot median you could add a lane and still not have a barrier.
- Todd said they saw this as a compromise. He said the thing it does for us from an environmental aspect is we don't even have to get into a discussion of the ability to add future capacity because we can hang our hat on this as a safety issue.
- Randy asked if the distance is 50 feet, why doesn't the Roadside Design Guide say that. Todd said because no one will definitively come out and say it should be exactly this. He said the FHWA report from 1993 comes about as close as any to saying that. No definitive statements are ever made. Todd said he thought that was because there is still judgment involved. He said if a state wants to use more width they should be able to do that but realize you could potentially be challenged in an environmental situation. Todd said that was their concern from an environmental perspective that we don't try to put some minimum out there. If we have a minimum stipulated we could fall back on it.
- In reference to a question and the Standard Drawing in the package Todd said the drawing is the current standard and does not reflect his recommended changes. Todd said he is here today to recommend changing the drawing to a 50-foot minimum. Comments indicated this would include the shoulders.

- Todd said the Legacy Parkway Project is changing to the 50-foot width because they feel it can honor what the Court asked us to do.
- Todd added that in the planning stage of projects we need to have goals in mind for corridors. That should be set in the planning environmental stage.
- Randy asked if this is being driven because of Legacy or because of future needs. Todd said the change to the drawing came about because we were looking at how we differed from AASHTO and why and looking for opportunities related to budget. Can we build more for less? Todd said what is a defensible width is a minimum. He said you can defend 50 feet real easy but 64 feet is harder.
- Todd said that is the recommendation and that the item was here for discussion. Stan asked Todd if it was for discussion or did he want approval. Todd said it was for discussion but he could go for approval. Todd said he noticed one thing Brent didn't have in the item and it may be for a future discussion. Todd said the old standard had a note that talked about an area for fill slope in relation to the right of way fence. Todd said he was concerned there could be a challenge on that and the fence location. Todd said from a maintenance standpoint the note is critical. He said if the slope is too steep and the fence too close maintenance would be difficult. Todd said he wasn't sure about the reasoning for removing that note.
- Randy made a recommendation that we go back and work with Maintenance to see the history on this and get the wording set for approval next time.
- The drawing will be brought back next meeting for approval.

**Action Item:** Brent Jensen to review the drawing with the Maintenance Division and update accordingly for the fill slope area of the drawing.

#### 10. Review of Assignment/Action Log (Agenda Item 10)

Barry handed out an Action Log status report. Richard said that Jim wanted us to status everyone on the Action Log so we wouldn't spend time going over it in detail. Richard said that he and Barry would prepare this before each meeting. He said this is something he felt they didn't have to follow up on because everyone knows what their assignments are. We just want to know what the status is. Richard said Jim's intent was to reduce the time spent on the Action Log.

Stan asked if the intent was to go over each item or just say this is what the items are. Barry said to just point out what the items are.

Discussion points were:

- Lloyd said he had a question on the painted cattle guard. He said it looks like a team was to be put together. John said they were working with the Research Division. John said Research has been interviewing a lot of Maintenance people. Lloyd asked who in Maintenance was involved. John said Ab Wakil interviewed a lot of people in Region 4 but he couldn't recall the names. Richard said Ab talked to Les Henry and Layne Slack. John said the bottom line is there is no research on this subject. John said one recommendation is to use thicker layers that would create more noise. Stan said Research believes that John would form a committee and look at a Standard Drawing. John said they also have concerns with the safety aspects of the two-inch angle iron on the sides of the cattle guard.
- Stan asked if there was any further discussion on the action items.
- The status report as handed out at the meeting follows:

#### **Action Item Update for October 21, 2004 Standards Committee Meeting**

(As of October 20, 2004, 3:15 p.m.)

**Item 1, Rumble Strips:** Waiting for BYU study to see if the direction the Department is going is appropriate. The drawing will be updated as required. Information provided by John Leonard. Target date still February 2005.

**Item 2, Prompt Payment:** The specification draft is out for review by and coordination with AGC and ACEC. Target date moved from October 2004 to February 2005.

**Item 3, Painted Cattle Guard:** Research shows the painted cattle guard is not effective where there is a high concentration of cattle. There is no proof that these cattle guards work. There is very little available research. Information provided by John Leonard. Target date still February 2005.

**Item 4, New Drawing of Four-Legged Intersection:** This item is still under development. Information provided by John Leonard. Suggests target date be moved from October 2004 to February 2005.

**Item 5, Deer Ramps:** A meeting is scheduled for November 4 between UDOT/Research and the Department of Wildlife Resources. Information provided by Michelle Page. No target date available.

**Item 6 Traffic Barriers:** This item is on schedule for the December meeting. Information on cable barriers is being added. Target date is the December 2004 meeting.

**Item 7, Standard Drawing PV 4:** Construction met with the AGC/UDOT group to review this drawing. No need for change was seen. Information provided by Darrell Giannonatti. Item closed.

**Item 8, Review e-mail, coordinate with Risk Management, and make proposal on Walkway issue:** This item is still being worked. Information provided by Todd Jensen. Target date moved from October 2004 to December 2004.

**Item 9, CB Series Standard Drawings:** Current agenda item 2.

**Item 10, Reconvene New Products Panel to clarify language on what is accepted:** Current agenda item 5.

**Item 11, QIT with Jim McMinimee and Dave Miles to review entire New Products procedure:** Still being worked. Information provided by Stan Burns. Target date was the October 2004 meeting.

11. Meeting Improvements (on-going agenda item) (Agenda Item 11). None.

12. Other Business:

#### **Next Meeting Discussion**

Barry asked if anyone had a problem going to February 2005 for the next meeting. Barry said if we had a December meeting and approved changes, those changes would be to a book that hadn't even been published yet. Richard said the Standards Committee is meeting in mid-November for a refresher of duties and responsibilities.

#### **FHWA Coordination and Approval of Standards**

Todd Emery asked about the FHWA approval of all Standard Specifications and Standard Drawings, saying that he hoped this was happening. Barry explained that when they put out a change he sends a letter to the FHWA office for Carlos Machado. He added that letter would now also go to Todd Emery. The letter lists the changes and requests approval.

Barry said there have never been any problems with the approval in the past. Barry said there is an FHWA representative on the Committee so they see what is happening and why.

Todd Emery asked if it would be better to do that here instead. Barry said he completely agreed and that he tried to do that a few years ago. Barry said he and Farrell discussed that with Clare Hendrickson when Clare was the FHWA representative on the Standards Committee. Clare didn't want that changed.

Barry said the representative is on the Committee but doesn't have a vote. Barry said if you are at the meeting when the items are discussed, you voice your comments and concerns, and the items are not approved if you have a problem, why can't Standards Committee approval be used for FHWA approval. Barry said at the time Clare said no we couldn't do it that way.



Barry told Todd that if he wanted to change the procedure he didn't have a problem with that. Barry said it would make things a lot easier. Todd Emery said it doesn't make sense to him if the Standards Committee goes through the process to approve something and then FHWA finds they missed something when we send it to them. Barry said FHWA gets the agenda package at the same time everyone else does and FHWA has an input at the meeting. Barry said he is good with the change if there is no disagreement. Todd said he is just getting involved in the process. Barry said if the change is made they will have to change the Standards Committee policy because there is a procedure in the policy that covers the subject.

Stan suggested that Todd go back to his office and decide how they want to handle this.

**Action Item:** Todd Emery to review FHWA approval process with those involved at the FHWA Regional Office and present any recommended change in procedure.

Adjourned.

The December 2004 meeting was cancelled. The next regular meeting of the Standards Committee has been scheduled for Thursday, February 24, 2005, at 8:00 a.m., in the 1st floor conference room of the Rampton Complex.

**Approval of Minutes:** The foregoing minutes were approved at a meeting of the Standards Committee held \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

**Assignment/Action Item Log** (Updated October 21, 2004 following the meeting)

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
June 27, 2002  October 31, 2002   December 19, 2002  February 27, 2003  April 24, 2003 June 26, 2003 August 28, 2003  October 30, 2003 December 18, 2003 February 26, 2004 April 29, 2004 June 24, 2004  August 26, 2004  October 21, 2004	1	Standard Drawing PV 8 (Rumble Strip)    Process being reviewed. Research looking into testing.  A policy is to be developed over the next several months.  No change No further updates. Target date changed. Progress continuing. To work with Research. Process continuing. Still being worked. No update Jim to follow up with Research. Research has study with University of Utah  Research study complete. Policy being written.  Waiting for BYU study results.	Darrell to assign someone from Construction. Richard Miller from Maintenance. Fred Doehring. Betty Purdie. Robert Hull to head the group.  Robert Hull Stan Burns  Robert Hull Stan Burns	Open	February 2005 meeting

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
December 19, 2002 February 27, 2003	2	01284 (Prompt Payment) discussion delayed for further review by AGC.	Chuck Larson	Open	February 2005 meeting
April 24, 2003		Being reviewed by Construction.	Darrell Giannonatti		
June 26, 2003		No change. Not due until August.			
August 28, 2003		Discussing with AGC. Updating with new Civil Rights Manager			
October 30, 2003		Discussions with AGC continue.			
December 18, 2003		Dropped from December 2003 meeting.			
February 26, 2004		Not on agenda.			
April 29, 2004		Something should be ready for next meeting.			
June 24, 2004		Delay with AGC coordination. Still working.			
August 26, 2004		No change			
October 21, 2004		Specification draft out for review.			

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
December 19, 2003	3	Painted Cattle Guard: With assistance from Research Division, Traffic and Safety to make recommendation.	Glenn Schulte John Leonard	Open	February 2005 meeting
February 27, 2003		No status.			
April 24, 2003		Traffic Engineering Panel to review			
June 26, 2003		No change. Not due until August.			
August 28, 2003		No change.			
October 30, 2003		Traffic and Safety and Research to work together to determine history and usage requirements.	Bob Hull Stan Burns		
December 18, 2003		No change in target date.			
February 26, 2004		Not on agenda.			
April 29, 2004		Still gathering information			
June 24, 2004		No report. E-mail sent to SAF and RES.			
August 26, 2004		Cattle Guard – Put team together to look into information related to cattle guard type and make a recommendation to include a usage policy and related standard specifications and drawings.	John Leonard		
October 21, 2004		No change.			

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
August 28, 2003	4	A new drawing depicting the four-legged intersection to be developed.	John Leonard	Open	February 2005 meeting
October 30, 2003		No change in status.			
December 18, 2003		Target date set.			
February 26, 2004		No change.			
April 29, 2004		Being developed			
June 24, 2004		No report. Not due until August. E-mail sent to SAF and RES.			
August 26, 2004		No change except target date.			
October 21, 2004		Still under development. Target date moved.			
February 26, 2004	5	Research in conjunction with Environmental to put together a proposal/drawing for deer ramps.	Blaine Leonard Barry Sharpe	Open	No target date set
April 29, 2004		No new information reported.			
June 24, 2004		No report. No target date. E-mail sent to SAF and RES.			
August 26, 2004		No new information			
October 21, 2004		Meeting set up with Dept of Wildlife Resources. No target date.			

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
April 29, 2004	6	Traffic Barriers: Task group to gather information and make a recommendation for a barrier type.	Jason Davis	Open	February 2005 meeting
June 24, 2004		Review still in progress.	Tim Biel		
August 26, 2004		No change			
October 21, 2004		No change			
June 24 2004	7	Review e-mail, coordinate with Risk Management, and make proposal on Walkway issue.	Boyd Wheeler	Open	February 2005 meeting
August 26, 2004		Dave Nazare to update Todd Jensen	Todd Jensen		
October 21, 2004		Still being worked.			
August 26, 2004	8	Form a QIT with Jim McMinimee and Dave Miles to review the entire New Products procedure.	Stan Burns	Open	February 2005 meeting
October 21, 2004		Still being worked.			
October 21, 2004	9	Section 00555, Prosecution and Progress, Liquidated Damages Table. Complete additional review and statistical analysis of Liquidated Damages table.	Pete Negus	Open	February 2005 meeting
October 21, 2004	10	Section 02843, Crash Cushions. Update Section to include completing coordination process on the submittal sheet.	Glenn Schulte	Open	February 2005 meeting

Date Initiated/Updated	Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
October 21, 2004	11	Standards for Median Widths in Urban Areas. Review the drawing with the Maintenance Division and update accordingly for the fill slope area of the drawing.	Brent Jensen	Open	February 2005 meeting
October 21, 2004	12	FHWA Coordination and Approval of Standards. Review FHWA approval process with those involved at the FHWA Regional Office and present any recommended change in procedure.	Todd Emery	Open	February 2005 meeting

Closed Items From Last Meeting (October 21, 2004)					
Date Initiated/Updated	Prior Item #	Action	Assignments	Status	Target Date
April 29, 2004	7	Standard Drawing PV 4, Concrete Pavement Details For Urban and Interstate: Team from Construction and Materials to find a solution.	Darrell Giannonatti	Closed	Closed
June 24, 2004		Construction to review with AGC and make proposal.			
August 26, 2004		Target date changed.			
October 21, 2004		Construction working with AGC. Target date moved. No need for change was seen.			
August 26, 2004	9	CB Series Standard Drawings and Supplemental Specification 02610, Pipe, Pipe-Arch, Structural Plate Pipe and Structural Pipe Arch and Supplemental Specification 02374, Grouted Riprap: The Hydraulics Section will update the drawings and specifications based on comments.	Denis Stuhff Michael Fazio	Closed	Closed
October 21, 2004		Item approved. Closed.			
August 26, 2004	10	Reconvene the New Products Panel to clarify the language on what is accepted.	Glenn Schulte Stan Burns	Closed	Closed
October 21, 2004		Direction of Panel agreed upon by Standards Committee. Panel action on-going over a period of years. Closed.			